

**XIII INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS
OF HISTORICAL SCIENCES**

Moscow, August 16—23, 1970

**Yu. POLYAKOV
(U.S.S.R.)**

**TRANSFORMATION OF THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE
IN THE U.S.S.R.**

**NAUKA* PUBLISHING HOUSE
Central department of oriental literature
Moscow 1970**

The 1917 October Revolution together with the subsequent revolutionary transformations wrought drastic changes in the social structure of the USSR. These changes, without precedent in history insofar as their character and scale are concerned, are of tremendous importance to the student of the general historical process.

Historians, philosophers, economists, while exploring the general problems involved in the history of the USSR, have given attention to the changes in the social structure, as well as to the causative factors behind these changes. Besides, there are special works by demographers, historians and sociologists devoted to various aspects of the problem. The principal lines of social changes in the USSR seem clear and cause no controversy among Soviet scholars, though outside the Soviet Union different points of view have currency.

For all this clarity, however, there still remain quite a few unstudied and controversial issues the reason for which should be sought in the enormous disparity of social structures which had once existed in different regions of the country. Conflicting statistical data and somewhat different approaches to the assessment of individual social groups complicate the task of historical exploration of the process of development of the social structure.

This paper is an attempt to trace back the changes in the social structure of the USSR over more than two decades, since the Great October Socialist Revolution till the Second World War (1939). That was the period of transition from capitalism to socialism marked by the evolution of socialist society, and it accounts for the major changes in the social structure of this country.

Those years witnessed the eradication of the exploiting classes — landlords, urban and rural bourgeoisie, the uprooting of exploitation in town and country, the drastic changes in the appearance of the working class and peasantry, and the crystallization of a new, people's intelligentsia.

First of all, let us dwell on the social structure of Russia prior to the October Revolution of 1917¹. On the whole, it was a structure typical of a society at a middle stage of capitalist development but having a lot of peculiarities. The agrarian-industrial economy of the country caused a considerable numerical preponderance of rural population, although capitalist development brought forth numerous proletariat in the countryside and in towns. Appreciable remnants of feudalism still persisted in the pattern of the countryside.

There were many specific features in the social structure of many peoples of the Caucasus, Central Asia, Kazakhstan, Povolzhye (Volga area) and Siberia, where capitalist relations had so far made no inroads, or had just started their penetration.

Some of these peoples had no working class, the national bourgeoisie was only evolving, and the social structure reflected the predominance of feudal relations. Minor nationalities in the North and Far East of Russia were at the patriarchal-tribal level.

Assessing the summary data on the basis of the mentioned peculiarities we encounter a certain degree of disparity in the material provided by different sources.

In 1913 the total population of the Russian Empire was 165.7 mln. people². In the subsequent narration, however, in order to use compatible data, it is more appropriate to proceed from the population within the boundaries of the USSR prior to 17 September, 1939. Within that territorial framework 139.3 mln. people lived in 1913³. The urban population totalled 24.7 million (18 per cent), the rural population was 114.6 million (82 per cent)⁴.

The numerical strength of the proletariat (including members of their families) was put by various authors and sources at 23 to 24 million, or 16.7 to 17 per cent of the total population.⁵

This figure accounts for the urban and rural proletariat, as well as civil servants and employees of social and cultural establishments.

It seems appropriate to classify the intelligentsia and the civil servants as a separate group. This has been done by a number of authors who estimate the proportion of intellectuals and civil servants to be 2.2 per cent⁶. The proportion of the proletariat is accordingly put at

14.8 per cent, out of which the agricultural proletariat accounted for 3.5 per cent⁷.

Middle and poor peasants, together with handicraftsmen and artisans, numbered over 90 million, or 65.1 to 66.7 per cent as estimated by different sources^{8, 9}. Poor peasants, that is to say those with minimum-size land plots but often having no draught animals, nor a cow, nor the necessary implements, were predominant both in absolute and relative terms.

The workers, middle and poor peasants, petty civil servants and the lower strata of intellectuals, all these toilers who constituted the overwhelming majority of the country's population, were exploited by the upper classes and groups.

The class of landlords in Central Russia, in the Ukraine, Byelorussia and in several other areas was made up of nobility, but was also interwoven with commercial, financial and industrial circles, which trend persisted on an ever-increasing scale right up to the October Revolution. Thousands of old estates were taken over by new masters, many of whom simultaneously owned industrial and commercial establishments in towns or represented rural bourgeoisie. For all these reasons the class of landlords as such hardly lends itself to numerical evaluation. According to the 1917 data, there were 78,801 private estates with 633,585 people (less hired workers) in 38 provinces of the European part of Russia¹⁰. One must add to this figure the feudals of the Eastern section of the country and the upper tribal crust of many backward ethnic minorities. The landlords of Central Russia, Povolzhye, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Don area and other regions as well as the feudals and tribal nobility over the vast expanse of Asian Russia owned and controlled enormous land area.

Most sources do not classify the landlords and the feudal layers in the outskirts of the country as a separate group altogether.

The total numerical strength of the landlords, urban and rural bourgeoisie is estimated to be somewhere around 22 or 23 million (15.9¹¹ to 16.3¹² per cent). The 1936 Statistical Yearbook classified the landlords and the urban bourgeoisie as a separate group and put their total number at 5 million.¹³

The poor standards of the available sources have so far precluded determining, with a fair degree of accuracy, the numerical strength of not only the landlords and Oriental feudals, but also of various groups of urban bourgeoisie, be it large, middle or petty, higher functionaries, and the like groups ¹⁴.

The numerical strength of the rural bourgeoisie — koulaks — does not lend itself to an accurate estimate either. The 1936 Statistical Yearbook puts the number of koulaks at 17.1 million (12.3 per cent) ¹⁵. However, there are several lines of evidence pointing, in our opinion, to a smaller proportion of the koulaks, some 11.4 per cent ¹⁶.

In spite of some discrepancies of statistical data and inadequately developed characteristics of a number of class groups, the general indicators of the social structure seem clear enough.

They can be represented in the form of the following table, the alternative statistics given in brackets.

Total population — 100%
Proletariat — 14.8%
Proportion of agricultural proletariat — 3.5% (4.3%)
Intelligentsia and office workers — 2.2%
Peasants (poor and middle), handicraftsmen and artisans — 66.7% (65.1%)
Exploiting classes — 16.3% (15.9%)
Proportion of koulaks — 11.4% (12.3%)

This social structure was rent by a multitude of deep-going class contradiction. Along with the essential contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie inherent in capitalist society, old Russia was torn apart by a number of contradictions brought forth by the leftovers of feudalism and serfdom, by the colonial oppression of the peoples that lived in the fringes of the Empire, by the backwardness of many ethnic groups.

The proletariat rose against capitalist exploitation. The toiling peasantry fought on two social fronts — against the landlords and against the rural bourgeoisie. The working masses of the oppressed minorities waged a war for national liberation and against their "own" exploiting upper crust.

All these factors portended an imminent socialist revolution, which was the sole means of settling — as it

did — the social contradictions that had ripened within the bowels of Russian society.

The victorious October Revolution entailed radical social upheavals. First of all, the class of landlords was liquidated in a revolutionary manner. On the basis of the Decree on Land, adopted by the II All-Russia Congress of the Soviets on the night of 26 October (8 November), 1917, land was nationalized and the landlords' ownership of land abolished without any ransom whatever. The allotment of former landlords', church and Royal estates gave the peasants in the vicinity of 150 million dessiatinas of land (1 dessiatina = 2.7 acres).

The landlords' ownership of land was done away with by the peasants themselves under the guidance and with the aid of the working class, with the Soviet state giving active supervision and support.

Needless to say, liquidation of the landlords' class did not imply physical extermination of its members, but consisted in depriving the class of landlords as a whole of its economic basis with the result that it ceased to exist as a socio-economic force. As for the landlords themselves, they were given an opportunity to engage in socially useful labour both in towns and in the countryside. A small section of landlords chose to stay in the places of their former residence ¹⁷. But of course, quite a few ex-landlords, just as representatives of other exploiting classes, could not reconcile themselves to the loss of their privileges and rose against the revolution.

The landlords' ownership liquidation campaign was launched in late 1917 — early 1918. However, already in the spring and summer of 1918, as a result of the Civil War and foreign military intervention, considerable tracts of the country's territory were seized by the enemies of the Soviet Power (the Ukraine, Urals, Don, Caucasus, Byelorussia, part of Povolzhye, etc.). Therefore, the landlords' ownership of land in these territories was done away with later, following their liberation.

In some outskirts of the country agrarian reforms were effected much later. In Kazakhstan, North Kirghizia, in some sections of Uzbekistan and such like, only partial agrarian transformations were carried out in 1918-20, whereby only that land was confiscated which remained in the ownership of capitalists — owners of cot-

ton plantations, large immigrant koulaks and some feudals.¹⁸ In South Kirghizia, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan and other areas the land property of the feudals (bais, manaps) remained all but untouched.

In South Kirghizia, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan the land-and-water reform was implemented in the late 20's. In the course of the reform landlords' estates were ultimately disposed of, rich farms were deprived of excessive land in favour of landless and poor peasants¹⁹. In Kazakhstan the first **massive** reallocation of land occurred in 1926-28 when pastures and haying fields were taken from the feudals — bais²⁰. Then in 1928 the draught animals, cattle and implements in possession of the bais, who, while accounting for only 6 per cent of all farms, owned 33.8 per cent of all cattle and draught animals, were confiscated²¹.

The above examples have been given with an express purpose of emphasizing once again the extremely motley pattern of conditions that prevailed over the vast territory of the former Russian Empire. Accordingly the agrarian transformations bore the imprint of these peculiarities and had their own specific features insofar as their nature and time of implementation are concerned. The latter specificity is the subject of numerous historical and economic investigations.

Immediately following the October Revolution a campaign was launched to eradicate the large and middle urban bourgeoisie. At the end of 1917 the new government started to nationalize factories and plants, private banks, commercial establishments, merchant marine, large "rentable" houses, and the like. In April 1918 foreign trade was nationalized²²; on 28 June, 1918, a decree was promulgated on universal nationalization of large-scale industry²³. By 31 August, 1918, over 3,000 enterprises had been nationalized.²⁴

The pace of nationalization on the scale of the entire country was largely associated with the military situation on the fronts of the Civil War, as it was not until after the territories temporarily seized by the counter-revolutionists and interventionists had been liberated that nationalization could be carried out.

By the end of the Civil War the overwhelming majority of large and medium-scale industrial enterprises

had been nationalized. An ordinance of the Supreme Council of National Economy (SCNE) of 29 November, 1920, decreed the nationalization of small-scale private undertakings (employing from 5 to 10 workers)²⁵.

Thus, in the years 1918-20 the large and middle urban bourgeoisie was in the main liquidated, and that class, having been deprived of its economic foundation, ceased to be an independent social force. Certainly, many representatives of the bourgeoisie retained some wealth, connections and enterprising spirit, and engaged in various forms of non-productive activities, such as, for instance, commercial speculation.

On the other hand, many former proprietors-professionals placed themselves at the disposal of the Soviet state and devoted their knowledge and experience to the cause of economic construction.

The socialist revolution broke the old state machinery which had been created by the exploiting classes to further their dominance. A new state machinery was evolved charged with the task of protecting the interests of the working people. The positions in the new offices and departments were filled by representatives of the toiling classes, chiefly industrial workers. Most highly-placed functionaries, closely associated with the landlords and the bourgeoisie, were expelled from the state machinery, but the majority of office workers-professionals were allowed to keep their jobs.

In the spring and summer of 1918, first in the central regions of the country and then in the territories one after another liberated from the enemy, the proletarian and semi-proletarian masses in the countryside, most actively aided and abetted by the urban working class, declared war on the rural bourgeoisie — koulaks.

Of the total 80 million dessiatinas of land in possession of the koulaks some 50 million were taken over by the middle and poor peasants. Yet, it did not imply the liquidation of the koulaks as a class. It was just partial expropriation of the rural bourgeoisie, with the petty-goods economic pattern still dominating agricultural production. The partial expropriation of the koulaks was carried out mainly by way of allotment of the koulaks' property among small peasant farms rather than by socialization of this property.

The proportion of the koulaks fell dramatically. Thus, while before the Revolution the koulaks had accounted for about 15 per cent of the total peasantry, by the end of 1920 they constituted slightly more than 3 per cent, as shown by this author's research²⁶. Moreover, large farms (over 25 dessiatinas) had all but disappeared. In general the koulaks were considerably sapped in Central Russia and somewhat less in the Ukraine, Siberia, Povolzhye, on the Don and in the North Caucasus.

In their majority koulaks turned into middle peasants. But many of them engaged in secret, illegal activities. They stepped down tillage and sold cattle, but kept their producer goods and money and embarked upon speculation and money-lending. Thus, the koulaks still possessed a potential for a quick expansion of their positions.

So in the course of the socialist revolution and civil war cardinal changes were wrought in the country's social structure. The principal exploiting classes which had formerly held sway—the landlords and the urban bourgeoisie—were liquidated as a class and deprived of not only political power but of their economic foundation as well. The rural bourgeoisie suffered severe losses, shrank both in absolute and relative terms, and its economic positions were largely undermined.

The representatives of these classes partly carried on their unproductive activities in an illegal form, partly were absorbed by other social groups. A considerable group of exploiters took an active part in the armed counter-revolutionary struggle, were defeated and left the country. In 1921 from one and a half to two million White Guards (including members of their families) found themselves abroad. Among them there were quite a lot of rank-and-file people who had succumbed to anti-Bolshevik propaganda and left their Motherland. However, these people never indulged in anti-Soviet activities and sought ways of coming back to Soviet Russia.

Essential changes took place in the social structure of the toiling classes, too. The position of the proletariat underwent a radical change. Formerly an oppressed class deprived of all ownership of producer goods, it now became a class in control of state power and possessing, through the state, the socialized means of production.

The bulk of peasantry carried on as small independent farmers. Nevertheless, now that the peasants had taken over the landlords' and a considerable portion of the koulaks' land, there took place a large-scale realignment of various layers and groups of peasantry. The broad-scope socio-economic process of "depeasantization" carried on before the Revolution and aimed at eliminating the peasantry as a class by splitting it into rural bourgeoisie and agricultural proletariat, was stopped and a new process begun—consolidation of the middle layers accompanied by the shrinking of the polar groups—the koulaks and the village poor.

The category of landlords' farm laborers disappeared altogether, and the number of poor, landless, cowless, horseless peasants diminished considerably.

The incomparable diversity of economic, geographical and national conditions over the vast territory of Russia, which brought about a tremendous disparity in the conditions of peasants in different large areas, provinces and even regions, makes it next to impossible to obtain summary data regarding the correlation of different groups of peasants. Nevertheless, the general tendency causes no doubt, which is borne out by numerous documentary data; and it may be assumed, remembering that all the estimates are to an extent conventional, that by the end of the Civil War the poor peasants and farmhands constituted 35 to 40 per cent, and middle peasants—55 to 60 per cent of the entire peasantry²⁷.

During the 20's the New Economic Policy (NEP), which permitted limited and state-controlled development of capitalism, gave some impetus to the growth of capitalist elements in town and country alike. The urban population, depleted in the years of the Civil War, again started to increase²⁸. Industrial reconstruction boosted the consolidation and development of the working class, also severely bled by the Civil War. Yet the peasantry remained vastly predominant in the total population.

In the countryside the middle peasants continued to strengthen their position, the poor peasants were dwindling, the agricultural proletariat and the koulaks grew somewhat²⁹. The number of cooperated peasants and artisans, though still comparatively small, showed some increase.

In 1928 the population of the country totalled 152,352 thousand, out of which 26,343 thousand, or 17.3 per cent, were industrial and office workers (this category includes agricultural workers who numbered 2,219 thousand, or 1.5 per cent). Cooperated peasants (collective farmers), cooperated artisans and handicraftsmen constituted 4,406 thousand — 2.9 per cent.

There were 6,801 (4.5 per cent) thousand rural and urban bourgeoisie — 1,183 thousand (0.8 per cent) urban and 5,618 thousand (3.7 per cent) rural. The peasants, artisans and handicraftsmen numbered 111,131 thousand and accounted for 72.9 per cent of the total population³⁰.

These figures illustrate the social structure evolved in the first phase of revolutionary transformations. As against the pre-revolutionary times the new social structure had no landlords' class, the rural and particularly urban bourgeoisie had considerably shrivelled, there emerged a category of cooperated peasants, artisans and handicraftsmen. Since for a number of years the country had been engaged in reconstruction of the economy devastated by the war, and it was only in the second half of the 20's that industrial construction was started on a gradually increasing scale, the proportion of industrial and office workers grew but negligibly. On the contrary, the proportion of peasants, artisans and handicraftsmen became even higher.

It the late 20's the Sovien Union embarked upon a new stage of socialist construction which brought about new cardinal changes in the social structure of the population.

The tempestuous industrial development (socialist industrialization) boosted urban population, above all, the working class (during the First Five-Year Plan period the number of workers grew at an average rate of 21 per cent per annum)³¹. The pace of industrial advance far from slackened in the subsequent years as well.

Concurrently with socialist industrialization capitalist elements were being ousted from industry. The process of curtailing the capitalist sector in industry and trade started in 1927. In most cases private undertakings discontinued operation, having failed in the economic competition with cooperative and state establishments. Of course, much credit in this is due to the policy of the

state, which, far from supporting private trading and industrial enterprises, imposed restrictions on credits and supply of goods.

By 1932 private industry and trade was actually a thing of the past, and accordingly the urban bourgeoisie had ceased being an independent class. Now all factory and office workers were engaged in the socialist sector, which marked an important stage in the consolidation of the working class as a class of socialist society. By the beginning of the 30's, as a result of industrialization, unemployment was ultimately done away with.

Beginning with 1929 (especially since the second half of that year) peasants started to join cooperatives *en masse* (collectivization). The state responded by abandoning its policy of curbing the exploiting leanings of the koulaks and embarking upon the course of liquidating the koulaks as a class.

Their property was confiscated, which was done by the peasants themselves, and handed over to the emergent collective farms. Those koulaks who resisted collectivization were deported to other areas of the country. Thus, since early 1930 till the fall of 1932, 240,757 koulak families, i. e. less than one per cent of the total number of peasants, were deported from the areas covered by all-out collectivization³². In their new places of residence, mostly in Western Siberia and Kazakhstan, ex-koulaks worked on state farms, in the timber industry, on construction projects and in mines.

Part of the former koulaks moved to towns, others stayed in rural areas, naturally deprived of the possibility of pursuing exploiting farming. By the end of the First Five-Year Plan period the koulaks had been for all practical purposes liquidated as a class. Yet, in some national republics this process had its specific features and took longer to complete. Thus, in many regions of Tajikistan the policy of restricting the koulaks was pursued up until 1932. In Uzbekistan the koulaks were liquidated only in 1934, and in the mountainous areas of Dagestan — at the end of the Second Five-Year Plan period (1937)³³.

The process of collectivization proper lasted for many years and assumed a variety of patterns depending on the peculiarities of different republics and regions. First

of all, it was carried out in the vital cereals areas where it was as good as completed already by 1931.

By the end of the First Five-Year Plan period (1932) some 60 per cent of peasants in the Russian Federation and about 70 per cent of Ukrainian peasants had been cooperated into collective farms³⁴. The rate of collectivization was still higher in Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan. On the other hand, in Byelorussia and Azerbaijan only half of all peasants had been drawn into collective farms, and in Georgia and Armenia the percentage was the lowest — 36 to 38 per cent³⁵.

In the main collectivization was over by the end of the Second Five-Year Plan period (1937), with 93 per cent of peasants in the country as a whole coming under collective farms³⁶.

Liquidation of the rural and urban bourgeoisie, socialist industrialization and collectivization of agriculture, all these factors marked new qualitative changes in the social structure of society. Not only had the last remnants of the exploiting classes been disposed of ultimately and for good, but their roots pulled out; not only had exploitation of man by man been done away with, but the causes of exploitation uprooted.

The socialist society was in the main built. In the second half of the 30's the transition from capitalism to socialism was over.

A good idea about the changes in the social structure can be derived from the 1939 census. As of January 1939, the population of the country was 170.6 million,³⁷ of which 56.1 mln (33 per cent) lived in urban areas and 114.5 mln (67 per cent) — in the countryside³⁸. The skyrocketing proportion of the working class, which had by the time reached 32.5 per cent,³⁹ was the best proof of the successes the country had scored in the field of industrialization. Yet, a considerable proportion of the working class was made up of agricultural workers engaged at state agricultural establishments (state farms) which had sprung up in the wake of the Revolution on the basis of former landlords' estates. During the 30's state farms mushroomed owing to the development of virgin and long-fallow lands⁴⁰. In 1940 the state farms and state agricultural subsidiary establishments employed over 1.8 mln workers (less family members)⁴¹. There emerged

a new detachment of agricultural workers — personnel of the machine-and-tractor stations (MTS) set up to meet the requirements of collectivization. The MTS owned modern machinery and equipment of agricultural designation and catered to the needs of collective farms. In 1940 the MTS employed half a million workers (less family members)⁴².

The 1939 census showed a substantial increase in the proportion of office workers and intellectuals, which now constituted 17.7 per cent⁴³. This reflected the scale of the cultural revolution unfolding in the country. Eradication of illiteracy, the newly-introduced universal compulsory education and the tremendous growth of higher and vocational education raised the cultural standards of the people as a whole and brought forth a multi-million army of Soviet intellectuals who formed an organic part of the people both by their social origin and by the place they held in society.

Collective farmers constituted the largest group of population — 47.2 per cent⁴⁴. This class, which had crystallized in the cooperation of small individual peasant farms, was an essentially new class, that of socialist society.

Independent farmers and non-cooperated artisans formed a relatively minor group — only 2.6 per cent⁴⁵.

The socialist transformations wrought cardinal changes in the social structures of the various peoples of the country. The formerly backward peoples, that had not come to the capitalist phase, lived through a peculiar process whereby they leaped from patriarchal-tribal or feudal relations directly to socialism bypassing capitalism, and while the country as a whole had traversed a great distance from backwardness to progress, for many USSR peoples the leap was really fabulous. In the course of industrialization, collectivization and cultural revolution there sprang up throughout the country modern industry, large-scale socialist agriculture equipped with modern machinery; there emerged a national cadre of Soviet intellectuals. All the peoples of the Soviet Union developed along the same lines, though each people advanced on the basis of its specific features. After the victory of socialism, too, there remained differences between republics and regions, caused not only by local peculiarities but

also by certain geographical circumstances. Different republics had achieved different levels of industrial development, and the proportions of the working class and peasantry stood accordingly at different levels. Thus, in 1939 the working class was numerically the strongest in the Russian Federation (35 per cent), in the Ukraine (32.6 per cent) and Kazakhstan (33.8 per cent). In Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Kirghizia and Turkmenistan the proportion of the working class constituted from 21 to 25 odd per cent, in Armenia, Georgia and Uzbekistan — from 17.6 to 19.5 per cent, and in Tajikistan — 12.9 per cent⁴⁶. In several republics the quota of independent farmers and non-cooperated artisans in 1939 was higher than the average figure for the entire country (more than 4 per cent in Azerbaijan, Kirghizia and Tajikistan, 6.4 per cent in Byelorussia and 10.6 per cent in Georgia).

* * *

Thus, the October Revolution and two decades of subsequent socialist construction triggered unheard-of profound upheavals in the social structure of the country. In place of antagonistic classes socially positioned on opposite poles there emerged a single monolithic socialist society, whose principal classes — workers and collective peasantry, as well as the social layer — intelligentsia, are friendly rather than antagonistic classes. All social groups came to lean on the stereotype social ownership of the means of production. They are blended together by the single socialist economic structure and cherish common aspirations. The socialist society is free from exploitation and exploiting groups, from feudal and capitalist forms of ownership antagonizing people.

The late 30's marked a new stage in the development of the social structure of the USSR — the country embarked upon the path of gradual obliteration of all social, be it inter- or intra-class, differences. This process is carried on as part of the general programme of communist construction in the Soviet Union.

¹ For lack of statistical material use is made mostly of the data as of 1913 — the year immediately preceding the First World War. The definable changes which occurred over the period from 1913 to 1917 are mentioned in the text.

² «Народное хозяйство СССР в 1959 году. Статистический ежегодник», М., 1960, стр. 7.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid., стр. 9.

⁵ «Социалистическое строительство СССР. Статистический ежегодник», М., 1936, стр. XXX; «Страна Советов за 50 лет. Сборник статистических материалов», М., 1967, стр. 3; «Народное хозяйство СССР. Статистический сборник», М., 1956, стр. 19.

⁶ «Советская историческая энциклопедия», т. 7, стр. 412; «Всемирно-историческое значение Великой Октябрьской социалистической революции», М., 1957, стр. 65.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ «Социалистическое строительство СССР», стр. XXX.

⁹ «Страна Советов за 50 лет...», стр. 3; «Народное хозяйство СССР. Статистический сборник», М., 1956, стр. 19.

¹⁰ «Погубернские итоги Всероссийской сельскохозяйственной и поземельной переписи 1917 г.», в кн. «Труды ЦСУ», т. V, вып. I, М., 1921, стр. 42—43.

¹¹ «Социалистическое строительство СССР», стр. XXX.

¹² The figure 16.3 per cent is given by modern statistics.

¹³ «Социалистическое строительство СССР», стр. XXX.

¹⁴ Some works estimate the numerical strength of the large bourgeoisie, landlords, higher functionaries, etc. as 4.1 mln as of 1913 within the boundaries of the Russian Empire, i. e. out of the total population of 165.7 mln. See: И. Ю. Писарев, Народонаселение СССР, М., 1962, стр. 68.

¹⁵ «Социалистическое строительство СССР», стр. XXX.

¹⁶ «Проблемы изменения социальной структуры советского общества», М., 1968, стр. 19.

¹⁷ In 1925, 10, 500 former landlords were registered as living in the places of their former residence.

¹⁸ Р. Х. Аминова, Аграрная политика Советской власти в Узбекистане (1917—1920 гг.), Ташкент, 1963, стр. 74—114; «История советского крестьянства и колхозного строительства в СССР», М., 1963, стр. 84, 101.

¹⁹ «История советского крестьянства...», стр. 88, 108; «История Туркменской ССР», т. 2, Ашхабад, 1957, стр. 286—288.

²⁰ М. Шаумян, От кочевья к социализму, Алма-Ата, 1965, стр. 47—50.

²¹ Ibid., стр. 51—53.

²² «Собрание указаний и распоряжений рабочего и крестьянского правительства РСФСР» /СУ/, 1918, № 33, стр. 432.

²³ СУ, 1918, № 47, стр. 559.

²⁴ П. И. Лященко, История народного хозяйства СССР, М., 1956, стр. 36.

²⁵ СУ, 1920, № 93, стр. 512.

²⁶ See Ю. А. Поляков, Переход к нэпу и советское крестьянство, М., 1967, стр. 134—139. It must be realized that owing to the inadequacy of the statistical material dating back to the Civil War period this figure is conventional.

- ²⁷ Ю. А. Поляков, *op. cit.*, стр. 129—133, 140—141.
- ²⁸ According to the census of December 17, 1926, the USSR population amounted to 147 mln, with 26.3 mln living in urban areas and 130.7 in the countryside. The percentages 18 and 82 per cent are the same as in 1913. (See «Народное хозяйство СССР в 1959 г.», стр. 9).
- ²⁹ «Тяжесть обложения в СССР (социальный состав, доходы и налоговые платежи населения СССР в 1924—1925 гг., 1925—1926 гг. и 1926—1927 гг.). Доклад Комиссии СНК СССР по изучению тяжести обложения населения Союза», М., 1928, стр. 74—75.
- ³⁰ «Социалистическое строительство СССР», стр. XXX, табл. 2. This source has another category — «other population» (students, servicemen, pensioners). Modern statistical books, by excluding the «other population» category, accordingly give higher proportions of the factory and office workers — 17.6 per cent, peasants, artisans and handicraftsmen — 74.9 per cent and urban and rural bourgeoisie — 4.6 per cent. (See «Народное хозяйство СССР», стр. 19; «Страна Советов за 50 лет...», стр. 3).
- ³¹ «История СССР с древнейших времен до наших дней», т. VIII, М., 1967, стр. 533.
- ³² «История КПСС», М., 1963, стр. 463.
- ³³ «Построение фундамента социалистической экономики в СССР: 1926—1932 гг.», М., 1960, стр. 41.
- ³⁴ Ibid.
- ³⁵ Ibid.
- ³⁶ Советская историческая энциклопедия, т. 7, М., 1965, стр. 495.
- ³⁷ «Народное хозяйство СССР в 1959 г. стр. 7.
- ³⁸ Ibid., стр. 9.
- ³⁹ «Итоги Всесоюзной переписи населения 1959 г. (сводный том)», М., 1962, табл. 28.
- ⁴⁰ In 1928 there were 1,407 state farms, in 1940—4,159 («Сельское хозяйство СССР. Статистический сборник», М., 1960, стр. 41).
- ⁴¹ Ibid., стр. 450.
- ⁴² Ibid.
- ⁴³ «Итоги Всесоюзной переписи населения 1959 г.», табл. 28.
- ⁴⁴ Ibid. The cooperated handicraftsmen (2.3 per cent) also come under this category.
- ⁴⁵ Ibid.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid.